Quantum communication enables new possibilities that were unthinkable in the classical world, notably including secure key distribution [1, 2]. The main hurdle to the implementation of quantum communication, however, is the fragility of quantum states to noise. To tackle this problem, quantum error correction schemes encode information into multiple quantum particles, using redundancy to mitigate the effects of noise [3, 4].

When the same communication channel is used multiple times, the errors occurring at different times generally exhibit correlations. Classically, these correlations do not affect the evolution of individual particles: a single classical particle can only traverse the channel at a definite moment of time, and its evolution is insensitive to the correlations between subsequent uses of the channel. In stark contrast, here we show that a single quantum particle can sense the correlations between multiple uses of a channel at different moments of time. Taking advantage of this phenomenon, it is possible to enhance the amount of information that the particle can reliably carry through the channel. In an extreme example, we show that a transmission line that outputs white noise at every time step can exhibit correlations that enable a perfect transmission of classical bits. When multiple transmission lines are available, time correlations can be used to simulate the application of quantum channels in a coherent superposition of alternative causal orders, and even to provide communication advantages that are not accessible through the superposition of causal orders.

Quantum communication enables new possibilities that were unthinkable in the classical world, notably including secure key distribution [1, 2]. The main hurdle to the implementation of quantum communication, however, is the fragility of quantum states to noise. To tackle this problem, quantum error correction schemes encode information into multiple quantum particles, using redundancy to mitigate the effects of noise [3, 4].

When the same communication channel is used multiple times, the errors occurring at different times generally exhibit correlations. Classically, these correlations do not affect the evolution of individual particles: a single classical particle can only traverse the channel at a definite moment of time, and its evolution is insensitive to the correlations between subsequent uses of the channel. In stark contrast, here we show that a single quantum particle can sense the correlations between multiple uses of a channel at different moments of time. Taking advantage of this phenomenon, it is possible to enhance the amount of information that the particle can reliably carry through the channel. In an extreme example, we show that a transmission line that outputs white noise at every time step can exhibit correlations that enable a perfect transmission of classical bits. When multiple transmission lines are available, time correlations can be used to simulate the application of quantum channels in a coherent superposition of alternative causal orders, and even to provide communication advantages that are not accessible through the superposition of causal orders.

The presence of correlations is both a threat and an opportunity for communication. On the one hand, it can undermine the effectiveness of standard error correcting schemes, which assume independent errors on the transmitted particles. On the other hand, tailored codes that exploit the correlations among different particles can enhance the transmission of information [6, 8, 12, 26].

Like most error correcting schemes, the existing codes for correlated noise use multiple physical particles to encode a single logical message. Classically, the use of multiple particles is essential: since a single classical particle can only traverse a communication channel at a definite moment of time, the correlations between different uses of the channel do not affect the particle’s evolution. The same conclusion holds even if the moment of transmission is chosen at random: in this case, the resulting evolution is simply the average of the evolutions associated to each individual moment of time, independently of the time correlations.

In stark contrast, here we show that a single quantum particle can sense the correlations between multiple uses of the same quantum communication channel. Taking advantage of this fact, it is possible to enhance the amount of information that a single particle can carry from a sender to a receiver. We demonstrate this effect in a rather extreme example, in which a single quantum particle is used to reliably convey a bit of classical information through a transmission line that completely erases information at every definite time step. The perfect transmission of a classical bit per particle witnesses the presence of correlations between different uses of the transmission line: in the lack of correlations, we show that the number of bits that can be reliably transmitted per particle is strictly smaller than one.

Time-correlated channels are also interesting for foundational reasons. Recently, they have been proposed as a way to reproduce the use of quantum channels in a superposition of different causal orders [27, 28]. In particular, they have been used to reproduce the action of the quantum SWITCH [29, 30], a higher-order operation that combines two variable quantum channels in a superposition of two alternative orders. In practice, time-correlated channels underlie all the existing experimental setups inspired by the quantum SWITCH [31, 32].

Here we show that the access to time-correlated channels is an even more powerful resource than the ability to combine ordinary quantum channels in a superposition of
alternative orders. To make this point, we consider two independent, time-correlated channels, with the property that their action is completely depolarising at all time steps. Remarkably, we find that the time-correlations that reproduce the quantum SWITCH are not the most favourable for the transmission of classical information: while the quantum SWITCH of two completely depolarising channels can at most yield 0.049 bits of classical communication \[38\] \[39\], a more sophisticated pattern of time-correlations yields a communication of at least 0.31 bits. The gap between these two values further highlights the power of time-correlations, which are capable of reproducing the benefits of the superposition of causal orders, and even of surpassing them.

Transmission of a single particle at a superposition of different times.—A transmission line that can be accessed at \( k \) different times is described by a correlated quantum channel \([6]\). Mathematically, the correlated channel is a linear map transforming density matrices of the composite system \( S_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes S_k \), where \( S_j \) denotes the system sent at the \( j \)-th time. Note that, in general, the \( k \) systems sent at \( k \) different times can be initially prepared in an arbitrary entangled state.

Correlated quantum channels are also known as quantum memory channels \([7, 20]\), quantum combs \([40, 41]\), or non-Markovian quantum processes \([9, 42]\). In the following we will focus on the \( k = 2 \) case, corresponding to a transmission line that can be accessed at two different time steps, hereafter denoted by \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \). We consider random unitary channels of the form

\[
R(\rho_{12}) = \sum_{m,n} p(m,n) (U_m \otimes U_n) \rho_{12} (U_m \otimes U_n)^\dagger, \tag{1}
\]

where \( U_m \) and \( U_n \) are unitary gates in a given set, and \( p(m,n) \) is a joint probability distribution. Here, the system sent at time \( t_1 \) experiences the unitary gate \( U_m \), while the system sent at time \( t_2 \) experiences the gate \( U_n \). The density matrix \( \rho_{12} \) represents the joint state of the two systems sent at two times \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \), that is, \( \rho_{12} \) a density matrix on the Hilbert space of the composite system \( S_1 \otimes S_2 \). The probability distribution \( p(m,n) \) specifies the correlations between the random unitary evolutions experienced by system \( S_1 \) and system \( S_2 \).

Physically, a correlated random unitary channel of the form \(1\) can appear in a photonic setup where the systems \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \) are modes of the electromagnetic field associated to two different time bins \([43, 44]\). The noisy channel can correspond e.g. to the action of an optical fibre, where the random unitary changes of the photon polarisation arise from random fluctuations in the birefringence. Correlations between the unitaries at different times can arise when the time difference \( t_2 - t_1 \) between successive uses of the channels is smaller than the time scale on which the birefringence fluctuates.

Consider now the situation where the input of the correlated channel \([1]\) is a single particle, carrying information in its internal degree of freedom. Classically, the particle must be sent either at time \( t_1 \), or at time \( t_2 \), or at some random mixture of \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \). When the particle is sent at time \( t_1 \), its evolution is given by the reduced channel \( R_1(\rho) := \sum_{m} p_1(m) U_m \rho U_m^\dagger \), where \( p_1(m) := \sum_n p(m,n) \) is the marginal probability distribution of the unitaries at time \( t_1 \). Similarly, if the particle is sent at time \( t_2 \), its evolution is given by the channel \( R_2(\rho) := \sum_{m} p_2(n) U_n \rho U_n^\dagger \), with \( p_2(n) := \sum_m p(m,n) \). A random choice of transmission times then results into a random mixture of the evolutions corresponding to channels \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \). Crucially, the evolution of the particle is independent of any correlation that may present in the probability distributions \( p(m,n) \), that is, of any correlation between the first and the second use of the transmission line.

In contrast, quantum mechanics provides new ways to transmit a single particle that make it sensitive to the correlations between subsequent uses of a given transmission line. The key idea is that the time when the particle is transmitted can be indefinite, as the particle could be sent through the transmission line at a coherent superposition of times \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) (see illustration in Figure 1). The superposition of transmission times could be achieved by adding an interferometric setup before the transmission line, letting the particle travel on a coherent superposition of two paths, one of which includes a delay \([47]\).

For example, consider the case of a single photon, and denote by \( H_1 \) and \( V_1 \) (\( H_2 \) and \( V_2 \)) the horizontal and vertical polarisation modes in the first (second) time bin. Here we take the polarisation state to be the same on both paths, and so that the only role of the interferometric setup is to coherently control the moment of transmission. The result is a linear combination of states of the form \( (\alpha|H_1\rangle |0\rangle_{V_1} + \beta|0\rangle_{H_1}|1\rangle_{V_1}) \otimes |0\rangle_{H_2}|0\rangle_{V_2} \) and states of the form \( |0\rangle_{H_1}|0\rangle_{V_1} \otimes (\alpha|1\rangle_{H_2}|0\rangle_{V_2} + \beta|0\rangle_{H_2}|1\rangle_{V_2}) \). The composite system of the two modes in the first (second) time bin can be regarded as system \( S_1 \) (\( S_2 \)) in our general theory. The states produced by the interferometric setup can then be written as a linear combination of states of the form \( |\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle_2 \) and states of the form \( |\text{vac}\rangle_1 \otimes |\psi_i\rangle_2 \), where, for \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), |\text{vac}\rangle_i \) is the vacuum.
state of the modes in system $S_1$, and $|\psi\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle$ is the polarisation state. The change in the particle’s state upon the transmission is then computed by applying the channel (1) to the appropriate state.

Generalising the quantum optics example, one can model the transmission of a single particle through channel (1) by interpreting systems $S_1$ and $S_2$ as abstract modes, each of which can contain a variable number of particles equipped with an internal degree of freedom, such as the photon’s polarisation. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the Hilbert space of system $S_i$ has two orthogonal subspaces: a one-particle subspace, denoted by $A^{(i)}$, and a vacuum subspace, denoted by Vac$^{(i)}$. We assume that the dimension of the single particle subspace is the same for both $S_1$ and $S_2$, as in the example of the single-photon polarisation. Under this assumption, we have $A^{(1)} \simeq A^{(2)} \simeq M$, where $M$ is the internal degree of freedom of the particle. Also, we assume that each vacuum subspace is one-dimensional, and is spanned by a vacuum state $|\text{vac}\rangle_i$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

A single particle sent at a superposition of two moments of times will then be described by states of the form $\alpha |\psi\rangle_1 \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle_2 + \beta |\psi\rangle_1 \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle_2$, where $|\psi\rangle \in M$ is the state of the particle’s internal degree of freedom. For the transmission of the particle, we will consider channels that conserve the number of particles, i.e. that map states of a given sector into states of the same sector. This is the case, for example, for linear optical elements in quantum optics, which preserve the photon number. For the channel (1), preservation of the particle number means that the operators $U_m$ have the form

$$U_m = V_m + e^{i\phi_m} |\text{vac}\rangle \langle \text{vac}|,$$  

where $V_m$ is a unitary acting in the one-particle sector $M$, and $\phi_m \in [0, 2\pi)$ is a phase. Physically, $\phi_m$ corresponds to the phase difference that a single-particle state undergoes relative to the vacuum state under the global unitary $U_m$. In practice, it can be observed when the mode is prepared in a superposition of zero-particle and one-particle states. An example of this phase in quantum optics is given at the end of the Appendix A: this is also described in a more general context in Refs. 28, 48.

In the rest of this letter, we will focus on the case where the one-particle subspace is two-dimensional, as in the example of the single photon’s polarisation. We will consider channels where the unitaries $\{V_m\}$ are the four Pauli matrices $\{I, X, Y, Z\}$, labelled as $V_0 = I$, $V_1 = X$, $V_2 = Y$, and $V_3 = Z$. This choice means that the evolution of the one-particle subspaces $A^{(1)}$ and $A^{(2)}$ are described by Pauli channels.

Suppose that the time of transmission is controlled by a quantum degree of freedom. For example, the control could be the time-bin degree of freedom of a single photon. If the control is in state $|0\rangle$, then the message is sent through the first application of the channel, with the vacuum in the second application; vice versa if the control is in state $|1\rangle$. If the control is in a superposition state $|+\rangle$, the joint evolution of the message and the control is described by the channel

$$C(\rho \otimes \omega) = \sum_{m,n} p(m,n) W_{mn} (\rho \otimes \omega) W_{mn}^\dagger,$$  

where $W_{mn}$ is the unitary $W_{mn} := V_m e^{i\phi_m} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + e^{i\phi_m} V_n \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|$, and $\rho (\omega)$ is the initial state of the message (control). The derivation of Eq. (3) is provided in the Appendix A, where we also work out the extension to general memory channels. In practice, the control ‘time’ degree of freedom could be initialised in the $|+\rangle$ state by sending the particle, prior to transmission, through a Mach-Zehnder interferometer with a delay on one arm.

Perfect communication through white noise.—We now focus on the case where the evolution at any definite time step is completely depolarising on the message-carrying sector $M$, that is,

$$C(\rho \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|) = \frac{I}{2} \otimes |j\rangle\langle j| \quad \forall \rho, \forall j \in \{0, 1\}.$$  

Whenever the particle is sent at a definite moment of time, the message is replaced by white noise, and no information reaches the receiver.

Suppose now that the particle is sent at a superposition of two different times, with the control in the superposition state $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. The transmission of information is described by the effective channel $C_{\text{eff}}(\rho) := C(\rho \otimes |+\rangle\langle +|)$, mapping the initial state of the message into the final joint state of the message and the control. At the fundamental level, this enhancement is based on the ability of quantum particles to experience a coherent superposition of multiple time-evolutions 28, 49, 54.

As a measure of the information transmitted by the channel, we use the Holevo information, defined as $\chi(\mathcal{E}) := \max_{\{p_X, p_Y\}} I(X; B)_\rho$, where $I(X; B)_\rho$ is the von Neumann mutual information of a quantum state $\rho := \sum_x p_x |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \mathcal{E}(p_x)_B$, with $\{p_X, p_Y\}$ being the set of all possible ensembles of an input classical-quantum state. Operationally, the Holevo information characterises the number of bits that can be reliably sent using product states in the encoding, and is a lower bound to the classical capacity of the channel 55.

The Holevo information is a convex function, meaning that one has $\chi(\mathcal{E} + (1-p)\mathcal{F}) \leq p\chi(\mathcal{E}) + (1-p)\chi(\mathcal{F})$, for every pair of channels $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ and probability $p \in [0, 1]$ (see Appendix B for a proof). As a consequence, the correlations that maximise the Holevo information of the effective channel $C_{\text{eff}}$ correspond to probability distributions $p(m,n)$ that are extreme points of the convex set defined by Equations (3) and (4). Such extreme points are probability distributions of the form $p(m,n) = \delta_{m,\sigma(n)}/4$, where $\sigma$ is a permutation of the set $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$.
For a permutation $\sigma$ which either swaps a pair of indices, or leaves them invariant, the effective channel is

$$C_{\text{eff}}(\rho) = \frac{I + G(\rho)}{2} \otimes |+\rangle\langle+| + \frac{I - G(\rho)}{2} \otimes |-\rangle\langle-|,$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

with $|\pm\rangle := (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $G(\rho) := \frac{1}{4} \sum_{m=0}^{3} e^{i[\phi(m) - \phi_{m}]} V_{m} \rho V_{m}^\dagger$ (see Appendix A for derivation). We call the map $G$ the latent correlation term, as it depends on the correlations between the evolution of the particle at two mutually exclusive moments of time.

A receiver who can only measure the control in the computational basis will observe the completely depolarising channel. However, if the receiver measures the control in the Fourier basis, then the latent correlation term $G$ can provide some information about the message.

Let us see how the latent correlation term depends on the permutation $\sigma$. For the identity permutation, satisfying $\sigma(m) = m, \forall m \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, the latent correlation term is a depolarising channel $G(\rho) = I/2 \forall \rho$, and no information can be transmitted through the channel. In contrast, suppose that the permutation $\sigma$ swaps two pairs of indices, for example mapping $(0, 1, 2, 3)$ into $(1, 0, 3, 2)$. In this case, we have $G(\rho) = \frac{1}{4} [I \rho X e^{i[\phi_{1} - \phi_{2}]} + X \rho Y e^{i[\phi_{2} - \phi_{3}]} + Y \rho Z e^{i[\phi_{3} - \phi_{1}]} + Z \rho e^{i[\phi_{1} - \phi_{3}]}]$. Note that $G(\rho)$ depends only on the differences $\phi_{0} - \phi_{1}$ and $\phi_{3} - \phi_{2}$. A plot of the Holevo information for all values of these differences is shown in Figure 2a.

The maximum value is achieved when $\phi_{1} - \phi_{0} = 0$ and $\phi_{3} - \phi_{2} = \pi/2$. In this case, perfect communication of one bit becomes possible by encoding the message in one of the states $\{|+, -\rangle\}$. Indeed, the latent correlation term satisfies the condition $G(|+\rangle\langle+|) = \pm I/2$, which implies

$$C_{\text{eff}}(|+\rangle\langle+|) = \frac{I}{2} \otimes |+\rangle\langle+|.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

Hence, the net effect of the superposition of times is to transfer the message to the output state of the control.

In summary, there exist time-correlated channels that look completely depolarising when the message is sent at any definite moment of time, and yet allow for a perfect transmission of classical information by sending messages at a coherent superposition of different times.

The correlations in the probability distribution $p(m, n)$ are essential in order to achieve perfect communication. By scanning through all combinations of phases $\{\phi_{m}\}_{m=0}^{3}$ (Figure 2a), we find that the maximum Holevo information achievable without correlations is 0.16 bits, which coincides with the value found in Ref. 53 for the transmission of a single particle in a superposition of two paths leading to independent depolarising channels.

**Communication through multiple time-correlated channels.**—Time-correlated channels can be used to mimic the use of ordinary quantum channels in a superposition of different causal orders. Suppose that two correlated channels $R_{A}$ and $R_{B}$, each of the form $|1\rangle$, are arranged as in Figure 3 and that a single particle is sent through a superposition of two alternative paths visiting each of the two channels exactly once. Assuming for simplicity that $R_{A} = R_{B}$, the joint evolution of the message and the control is described by the channel

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho \otimes \omega) = \sum_{m,n,k,l} p(m,n)p(k,l) W_{mnkl}(\rho \otimes \omega) W_{mnkl}^\dagger,$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where $W_{mnkl}$ is the control-unitary gate $W_{mnkl} := V_{l} V_{m} e^{i(\phi_{k} + \phi_{n})/4} |0\rangle\langle0| + V_{n} V_{k} e^{i(\phi_{m} + \phi_{l})/4} |1\rangle\langle1|$, with $p(m,n), \{V_{m}\}, \{\phi_{m}\}$ as in Equations (1) and (2) (see Appendix C for the derivation).

Again, we focus on the scenario where each use of each transmission line acts as a depolarising channel. When the probability distribution is perfectly correlated, i.e. $p(m,n) = \delta_{mn}/4 \forall m,n \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, the above configuration reproduces the action of two depolarising channels in a superposition of two alternative orders, corresponding to the so-called quantum SWITCH 29, 30 (see Appendix C).

In the above setting, one can reach a Holevo information of 0.049 bits by initialising the control in the state...
At the foundational level, sending a single particle in a superposition of paths through time-correlated channels can also simulate the use of independent channels in a superposition of causal orders. We showed that, with more elaborate patterns of correlations, one can achieve an even greater enhancement than the one found for the superposition of orders. This result establishes time-correlated channels as an appealing resource, which can be used as a testbed for foundational results on causal order, and, at the same time, as a building block for new communication protocols.
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\[
\mathcal{K}(\rho) = \frac{1}{8}\left\{ \left( \cos 2(\phi_1 - \phi_0) + \cos 2(\phi_3 - \phi_2) \right) - 2X\rho X \right\}.
\]

The Holevo information for this permutation, as a function of the phase differences \(\phi_1 - \phi_0\) and \(\phi_3 - \phi_2\), is shown in Figure 4b. The maximum Holevo information over all combinations of phases \(\{\phi_m\}_{m=0}^3\) is given by \(\max_{\phi_{mn}} \chi(E_{\text{eff},\sigma}) = 0.31\). This value is larger than the classical capacity of 0.049 achieved by the quantum switch, corresponding to perfect correlations \(p(m, n) = \delta_{m,n}/4\). Summarising, not only can time-correlations reproduce the superposition of causal orders, but also they can surpass its advantages.

**Conclusions.**—We have shown that a single quantum particle can probe the correlations between different uses of a noisy transmission line. By coherently controlling the particle’s time of transmission, these correlations can boost the communication rate to values that would be impossible if the moment of transmission were a classical, well-defined variable. Our result demonstrates that a single quantum particle, previously shown to offer advantages in two-way communication \([39]\), is a valuable resource even in the standard scenario where communication goes from a sender to a receiver. An important avenue for future research is experimentally investigating the tolerance of our protocols to the errors associated with the encoding of a single particle at a superposition of times, such as timing errors and decoherence between the two different modes.

We now extend our analysis to more general correlations. Since the Holevo information is convex, we focus on the extreme points of the set of probability distributions \(p(m, n)\), corresponding to permutations. Consider a permutation \(\sigma\) of \([0,1,2,3]\) that either swaps a pair of indices, or leaves it invariant. When the control is prepared in the state \(|+\rangle\rangle\), the effective channel describing the transmission of the message is

\[
\mathcal{E}_{\text{eff}}(\rho) = \frac{I + \mathcal{K}(\rho)}{2} \otimes |+\rangle\langle+| + \frac{I - \mathcal{K}(\rho)}{2} \otimes |-\rangle\langle-|,
\]

where

\[
\mathcal{K}(\rho) = \frac{1}{15} \sum_{m=0}^3 e^{i \phi_{mn} - \phi_m + \phi_{\sigma(m)} - \phi_{\sigma(n)}} V_{\sigma(n)} V_m \rho V_m^\dagger V_{\sigma(m)}^\dagger (\text{see Appendix C for derivation}).
\]

For the permutation \(\sigma\) which maps \((0,1,2,3)\) to \((1,0,3,2)\), we have

\[
\mathcal{K}(\rho) = \frac{1}{8} \left\{ \left( \cos 2(\phi_1 - \phi_0) + \cos 2(\phi_3 - \phi_2) \right) + 2X\rho X \right\}.
\]
We model each use of the transmission line when no vacuum extension can be determined by probing the action of the channel on superpositions of the vacuum and one-particle states. Physically, the choice of vacuum extension is determined by the Hamiltonian of the field describing the vacuum and the one-particle sector.

Consider now a transmission line described by a 2-step correlated quantum channel \( B \in \text{Chan}(S^{(1)} \otimes S^{(2)}) \), with \( S^{(1)} \approx S^{(2)} \). A physical implementation of the channel corresponds to a vacuum extension \( \tilde{B} \), acting on the extended systems \( \tilde{S}^{(1)} := S^{(1)} \oplus \text{Vac} \) and \( \tilde{S}^{(2)} := S^{(2)} \oplus \text{Vac} \). Their tensor product \( \tilde{S}^{(1)} \otimes \tilde{S}^{(2)} \) contains a no-particle sector \( \text{Vac} \otimes \text{Vac} \), a one-particle sector \( (\text{Vac} \otimes S^{(1)}) \oplus (S^{(2)} \otimes \text{Vac}) \), and a two-particle sector \( S^{(1)} \otimes S^{(2)} \). We assume that \( S^{(1)} \approx S^{(2)} \approx M \), where \( M \) is the message-carrying degree of freedom of the particle. The one-particle sector is then isomorphic to \( M \otimes C \), where \( C \) is a qubit system, corresponding to a degree of freedom of the particle that controls its time of transmission. When the control is in state \( |0\rangle \), the message is sent through the first application of the channel and the vacuum is sent in the second application; vice versa for the control in state \( |1\rangle \).

We now define the superposition of times of \( B \) specified by the vacuum extension \( \tilde{B} \) as the restriction of \( \tilde{B} \) to the one-particle sector:

\[
S(\tilde{B})(\rho \otimes \omega) := U^\dagger \circ \tilde{B} \circ U(\rho \otimes \omega),
\]

where \( U(\cdot) := U(\cdot) U^\dagger \) is the isomorphism between \( M \otimes C \) and the one-particle sector \( (S^{(1)} \otimes \text{Vac}) \oplus (S^{(2)} \otimes \text{Vac}) \), and the unitary \( U \) is defined by

\[
U(|0\rangle_M \otimes |0\rangle_C) := |\psi\rangle_{S^{(1)} \otimes \text{Vac}} \langle \text{Vac} |_{S^{(2)}},
\]

\[
U(|1\rangle_M \otimes |1\rangle_C) := |\text{Vac} \rangle_{S^{(1)} \otimes \text{Vac}} \langle \psi \rangle_{S^{(2)}},
\]

The transformation \( S : \text{Chan}(S^{(1)} \otimes S^{(2)}) \to \text{Chan}(M \otimes C) \) is a quantum supermap, that is, a transformation from quantum channels to quantum channels satisfying appropriate consistency requirements [39, 41, 58].

**Appendix A: Transmission of a single particle through a time-correlated channel**

A transmission line used to send a quantum particle at a well-defined moment of time is described by a quantum channel, that is, a completely positive trace-preserving map transforming density matrices on the particle’s Hilbert space. In the following we will denote by \( \text{Chan}(S, S’) \) the set of quantum channels with input system \( S \) and (possibly different) output system \( S’ \). When \( S = S’ \) we will use the shorthand \( \text{Chan}(S) \).

The action of a quantum channel on a density matrix \( \rho \) can be conveniently written in the Kraus representation \( A(\rho) = \sum_i A_i \rho A_i^\dagger \), where \{\( A_i \)\} is a (non-unique) set of operators, satisfying \( \sum_i A_i^\dagger A_i = I \).

A transmission line that can be used \( k \) times in succession is described by a \( k \)-step correlated quantum channel [6] (also known as a quantum \( k \)-comb [40, 41]). That is, a quantum channel \( B \in \text{Chan}(S^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes S^{(k)}, S^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes S^{(k)}) \), with \( k \) input-output pairs \( (S^{(i)}, S^{(i)\dagger})_{i=1}^k \), where no signal propagates from an input \( S^{(i)} \) to an output \( S^{(j)} \) for \( j < i \) [40]. A 2-step correlated quantum channel is illustrated in Figure 3.

The transmission of a particle at a superposition of different times can be made explicit using the notion of vacuum extension [25]. Consider first a transmission line described by an ordinary quantum channel \( A \in \text{Chan}(S) \). We model each use of the transmission line when no message is sent through it as a quantum channel acting on the vacuum state \( |\text{vac}\rangle \) in the vacuum sector \( \text{Vac} \) [25, 53, 54], which is orthogonal to the message-carrying sector \( S \). Overall, a transmission line acts on the extended system \( \tilde{S} := S \oplus \text{Vac} \), which is associated with the Hilbert space given by \( \mathcal{H}_S \oplus \mathcal{H}_\text{Vac} \), where \( \mathcal{H}_\text{Vac} \) is the (here assumed to be one-dimensional) vacuum Hilbert space. Given an original channel \( A \), we define a vacuum extension \( \tilde{A} \) of \( A \) as any channel which acts as \( A \) \( (I_{\text{Vac}}) \) when the input is a state in sector \( S \) (Vac). The Kraus operators of \( \tilde{A} \) are \( \tilde{A}_i = A_i \oplus A_i |\text{vac}\rangle \langle \text{vac}| \), where \{\( A_i \)\}_{i=0}^r \) is a Kraus representation of \( A \), and \( \{|\alpha_i\rangle\}_{i=0}^r \) are vacuum amplitudes satisfying \( \sum_{i=0}^r |\alpha_i|^2 = 1 \).

A given channel has infinitely many possible vacuum extensions. In an actual communication scenario, the vacuum extension can be determined by probing the action of the channel on superpositions of the vacuum and one-particle states. Physically, the choice of vacuum extension is determined by the Hamiltonian of the field describing the vacuum and the one-particle sector.

**FIG. 5**. The left-hand side depicts a 2-step correlated quantum channel \( B \) taking two input states on systems \( S^{(1)} \) and \( S^{(2)} \), in succession. The right-hand side shows the physical implementation of the correlated channel via two unitary channels \( \tilde{W}_1 \) and \( \tilde{W}_2 \) [41] where the memory between the two uses of the channel is realised by a state \( |\eta\rangle \) of an environment \( E \), which is inaccessible to the communicating parties.
We now specialise to the case of correlated random unitary channels of the form
\[
R = \sum_{m,n} p(m,n) V_m \otimes V_n \in \text{Chan}(S^{(1)} \otimes S^{(2)}), \quad (A3)
\]
where \(V_m(\cdot) := V_m(\cdot)V_m^\dagger\) is a unitary channel, \(\{V_m\}\) is a set of unitary gates, and \(p(m,n)\) is a joint probability distribution. The vacuum extension of each unitary \(V_m\) is taken to be another unitary \(\tilde{V}_m\), which we write as \(\tilde{V}_m := U_m = V_m \otimes e^{i \phi_m} |\text{vac}\rangle\langle \text{vac}|\), where the vacuum amplitude is given by a complex phase, representing the coherent action of each possible noisy process on the one- and vacuum sectors. This leads to a vacuum extension of the correlated random unitary channel:
\[
\tilde{R} = \sum_{m,n} p(m,n) \tilde{V}_m \otimes \tilde{V}_n \in \text{Chan}(\tilde{S}^{(1)} \otimes \tilde{S}^{(2)}), \quad (A4)
\]
with \(\tilde{V}_m(\cdot) := \tilde{V}_m(\cdot)\tilde{V}_m^\dagger\), which is equivalent to Equation \([1]\) in the main text, with \(U_m = \tilde{V}_m\).

The superposition of times of \(R\) specified by the vacuum extension \(\tilde{R}\) is given by:
\[
S(\tilde{R})(\rho \otimes \omega) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{r-1} p(m,n) U^\dagger \circ (\tilde{V}_m \otimes \tilde{V}_n) \circ U (\rho \otimes \omega), \quad (A5)
\]
and is illustrated in Figure \([6]\). The Kraus operators of \(S(\tilde{R})\) are \(C_{mn} = \sqrt{p(m,n)} e^{i \phi_m} V_m \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sqrt{p(m,n)} V_n e^{i \phi_m} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|\), where \(e^{i \phi_m}\) is the vacuum amplitude associated with the unitary channel \(V_m\). This is equivalent to Equation \([3]\) in the main text, where the channel \(C(\rho \otimes \omega) := S(\tilde{R})(\rho \otimes \omega) = \sum_{mn} C_{mn}(\rho \otimes \omega) C_{mn}^\dagger\) and \(W_{mn} := C_{mn}/\sqrt{p(m,n)}\).

Finally, consider the case of a 2-step random unitary channel \(D_{\sigma}\), described by a completely depolarising channel (in dimension \(d\), implemented by a set of \(d^2\) orthogonal unitaries \(\{V_m\}_{m=0}^{d^2-1}\) when used only once at a definite time step, and with maximal correlations between successive uses described by a permutation \(\sigma\) in the choice of unitaries, i.e. \(p(m,n) = \delta_{m,\sigma(n)}\). The superposition of times of \(D_{\sigma}\) specified by the vacuum extensions \(\{\tilde{V}_m\}_{m=0}^{d^2-1}\), where \(\tilde{V}_m = V_m \otimes e^{i \phi_m} |\text{vac}\rangle\langle \text{vac}|\), is given by
\[
S(D_{\sigma})(\rho \otimes |+\rangle\langle +|) = \sum_{m=0}^{d^2-1} \frac{V_m}{d} \frac{V_m^\dagger}{d} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{2} \\
+ \sum_{m=0}^{d^2-1} e^{i[\phi_{\sigma(m)}] - \phi_m]} \frac{V_m}{d} \frac{V_m^\dagger}{d} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 1| \\
+ \sum_{m=0}^{d^2-1} e^{i[\phi_m - \phi_{\sigma(m)}]} \frac{V_{\sigma(m)}}{d} \frac{V_{\sigma(m)}^\dagger}{d} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 0|, \quad (A6)
\]
This reduces to Equation \([5] in the main text of the case \(d = 2\) when \(G(\rho) := \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{m=0}^{d^2-1} e^{i[\phi_{\sigma(m)}] - \phi_m]} V_m \rho V_m^\dagger_{\sigma(m)}\) is Hermitian.

The superposition of evolutions \([A6]\) can be naturally implemented in quantum optics. The message degree of freedom is realised by single-photon states with horizontal polarisation \(|1\rangle_{k,H} \otimes |0\rangle_{k,V}\) or vertical polarisation \(|0\rangle_{k,H} \otimes |1\rangle_{k,V}\); given in the Fock basis with wavevector \(k\), corresponding to the logical states \(|0\rangle_L\) and \(|1\rangle_L\), respectively. The control degree of freedom could, for example, be realised by the time-bin of the same photon \([13, 40]\), or in the case of a network of multiple channels, by the spatial mode of the photon.

For the superposition of times of correlated random unitary channels considered in this Letter, each unitary \(U_m\) [Equation \([1]\)] is realised by a Hamiltonian acting on both the one-particle polarisation and vacuum sectors. For example, consider a unitary implementing the \(Z\) gate on the polarisation degree of freedom: \(U_Z = Z \oplus e^{i \phi} |\text{vac}\rangle\langle \text{vac}|\). The Hamiltonian \(H = b/(\xi + \theta/2) a_{k,H}^\dagger a_{k,H} + (\xi - \theta/2) a_{k,V}^\dagger a_{k,V}\) induces the unitary \(U_i = e^{-i H t}\), which realises \(U_Z\) for \(\theta = \pi, \xi = \phi - \theta/2\) and time \(t = 1\) in suitable units.

**Appendix B: Proof of the convexity of the Holevo information as a function of quantum channels**

Here we prove that the Holevo information is a convex function of its input channel. The proof of this proposition relies on three standard facts from quantum Shannon theory, summarised in the following (see, e.g. \([55]\), for more details).

First, the Holevo information of a channel \(C\) can be expressed as
\[
\chi(C) = \max_{\rho_{XB}} I(X;B)_{\rho_{XB}} \quad (B1)
\]
where \(I(X;B)_{\rho} := -\text{Tr}[\rho_X \log \rho_X] - \text{Tr}[\rho_B \log \rho_B] + \text{Tr}[\rho_{XB} \log \rho_{XB}]\) is the quantum mutual information of
Hence, by Eq. (B3),
\[
\rho_{XB} = \sum_x p_x |x\rangle\langle x|_X \otimes \mathcal{C}(\rho_x),
\]  
(B2)
with marginals \(\rho_X := \text{Tr}_B[\rho_{XB}]\) and \(\rho_B := \text{Tr}_X[\rho_{XB}]\), \(\{p_x\}\) is a set of probabilities, \(\{\rho_x\}\) is a set of density matrices for the input system of channel \(\mathcal{C}\), and the maximisation in Equation (B1) is over all classical-quantum states of the form of \(\rho_{XB}\).

Second, the quantum mutual information can be expressed as
\[
I(A; B)_\rho = D(\rho_{AB} \| \rho_A \otimes \rho_B),
\]  
(B3)
where \(D(\rho||\sigma) := \text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho] - \text{Tr}[\rho \log \sigma]\) is the quantum relative entropy between two generic states \(\rho\) and \(\sigma\).

Third, the quantum relative entropy is jointly convex in its arguments: for sets of quantum states \(\{\rho^y\}, \{\sigma^y\}\) and probabilities \(\{q_y\}\) we have
\[
D \left( \sum_y q_y \rho^y \right) \geq \sum_y q_y D(\rho^y||\sigma^y). 
\]  
(B4)
Combining these three facts, one obtains the following proposition:

**Proposition 1.** Let \(\chi(\mathcal{C})\) be the Holevo information of a quantum channel \(\mathcal{C}\). Let \(\{C_y\}_{y}\) be a set of quantum channels and let \(\{q_y\}_y\) be a set of positive real numbers such that \(\sum_y q_y = 1\). Then
\[
\chi \left( \sum_y q_y C_y \right) \leq \sum_y q_y \chi(C_y),
\]  
(B5)
i.e. the Holevo information is a convex function of its input quantum channel.

**Proof.** By Eq. (B1),
\[
\chi \left( \sum_y q_y C_y \right) = \max_{\rho_{XB}} I(X; B)_{\rho},
\]
where \(\rho_{XB} = \sum_y q_y \sum_x p_x |x\rangle\langle x|_X \otimes C_y(\rho^x)\) (with \(C_y(\rho^x) := \text{Tr}_X[\rho_{XB}^y]\)).

Hence, by Eq. (B3),
\[
\chi \left( \sum_y q_y C_y \right) = \max_{\rho_{XB}} D(\rho_{XB} \| \rho_X \otimes \rho_B)
\]
\[
= \max_{\rho_{XB}} D \left( \sum_y q_y \rho_{XB}^y \| \sum_y q_y \rho_X^y \otimes \sum_y q_y \rho_B^y \right).
\]
Now, \(\rho_X^y := \text{Tr}_B \rho_{XB}^y\) does not depend on \(y\), so
\[
\sum_y q_y \rho_X^y = \rho_X = \rho_X.
\]  
Thus,
\[
\chi \left( \sum_y q_y C_y \right) = \max_{\rho_{XB}} D \left( \sum_y q_y \rho_{XB}^y \| \sum_y q_y \rho_X \otimes \rho_B^y \right)
\]  
(B6)
\[
\leq \sum_y q_y D \left( \rho_{XB}^y \| \rho_X \otimes \rho_B^y \right)
\]  
(B7)
for the choice of quantum states \(\{\rho_{XB}^y\}\) which maximises the expression on the RHS of Eq. (B6), by Eq. (B4). Now considering the maximisation of the RHS of Eq. (B7) over all quantum states \(\{\rho_{XB}^y\}\), we further have that
\[
\chi \left( \sum_y q_y C_y \right) \leq \max_{\rho_{XB}} \sum_y q_y D \left( \rho_{XB}^y \| \rho_X \otimes \rho_B^y \right)
\]  
\[
= \sum_y q_y \max_{\rho_{XB}} D \left( \rho_{XB}^y \| \rho_X \otimes \rho_B^y \right)
\]  
\[
= \sum_y q_y \max_{\rho_{XB}} I(X; B)_{\rho^y}
\]  
\[
= \sum_y q_y \chi(C_y)
\]
where the last two equalities follow from Eq. (B3) and Eq. (B1), respectively.

**Appendix C: Transmission of a single particle through a network of correlated channels and comparison with the quantum SWITCH**

In the following we will use the notation introduced in Appendix A.

Consider two 2-step random unitary channels, \(\mathcal{R}_A\) and \(\mathcal{R}_B\), with vacuum extensions \(\mathcal{R}_A \subset \text{Chan}(\mathcal{A}(1) \otimes \mathcal{A}(2))\) and \(\mathcal{R}_B \subset \text{Chan}(\mathcal{B}(1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(2))\), each one of the form of Equation (A4), connected in such a way that the output of the first use of each channel is taken as input to the second use of the other channel. We can describe this particular composition of two 2-step correlated channels by a supermap \(\mathcal{Z} : \text{Chan}(\mathcal{A}(1) \otimes \mathcal{A}(2)) \times \text{Chan}(\mathcal{B}(1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(2)) \rightarrow \text{Chan}(\mathcal{A}(1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(1), \mathcal{B}(2) \otimes \mathcal{A}(2))\) (where all of the input/output systems are isomorphic). This results in a new random unitary channel \(\mathcal{Q} := \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{R}_A, \mathcal{R}_B)\), which has a vacuum extension \(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} \in \text{Chan}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(1) \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(1), \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(2) \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(2))\) given by
\[
\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = \sum_{m,n,k,l} p(m,n)p(k,l) (\tilde{V}_l \circ \tilde{V}_m) (\tilde{V}_m \circ \tilde{V}_k).
\]  
(C1)
\(\tilde{V}_m(\cdot) := \tilde{V}_m(\cdot) \tilde{V}_m^\dagger\) is a unitary channel, \(\{V_m\}\) is a set of unitary gates, \(\tilde{V}_m = V_m \otimes e^{i\phi_m}\text{vac}\langle\text{vac}\rangle\), the index labels correspond to systems such that \(\tilde{V}_m \in \text{Chan}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(1))\), \(\tilde{V}_n \in \text{Chan}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(2))\), \(\tilde{V}_k \in \text{Chan}(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(1))\) and \(\tilde{V}_l \in \text{Chan}(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(2))\),
and \( p(m, n) \) is a joint probability distribution. Here, \( \tilde{Q} \) is regarded as a bipartite channel in \( \text{Chan}(\tilde{A}(1) \otimes \tilde{B}(1), \tilde{B}(2) \otimes \tilde{A}(2)) \).

For a general bipartite channel \( \mathcal{N} \in \text{Chan}(S^{(1)} \otimes S^{(2)}) \), we define the superposition of paths through \( \mathcal{N} \) specified by the vacuum extension \( \tilde{N} \) as the supermap \( \mathcal{S} : \text{Chan}(\tilde{S}^{(1)} \otimes \tilde{S}^{(2)}) \to \text{Chan}(M \otimes C) \) (where \( M \cong S^{(1)} \cong S^{(2)} \)) such that

\[
\mathcal{S}(\tilde{N})(\rho \otimes \omega) := U^\dagger \circ \tilde{N} \circ U (\rho \otimes \omega),
\]

where \( U \) is the isomorphism defined by Equation (A2). Here, the control qubit \( C \) is interpreted as the path of the particle, which can for example be realised by the spatial mode of the message-carrying photon. Physically, the superposition of paths through a bipartite channel corresponds to sending a single particle in a superposition of two paths, each leading to one of the two inputs of the channel [28].

For the example of two 2-step random unitary channels connected via the supermap \( \mathcal{S} \), resulting in the bipartite channel \( \tilde{Q} \) of Equation (C1), the superposition of paths through \( \tilde{Q} \) specified by the vacuum extension \( \tilde{Q} \) gives the channel \( E := \mathcal{S}(\tilde{Q}) \), whose Kraus operators are \( E_{mn} = \sqrt{p(m, n) p(k, l)} V_m V_n e^{i(\phi_m + \phi_n)} \otimes |0\rangle \rangle + \sqrt{p(m, n) p(k, l)} V_k V_l e^{i(\phi_m + \phi_n)} \otimes |1\rangle \rangle |1\rangle \rangle |1\rangle \rangle |0\rangle \rangle \). This is illustrated in Figure 7 and is equivalent to Equation (7) in the main text, with \( W_{mn} := E_{mn} / \sqrt{p(m, n) p(k, l)} \).

Consider now the case where each 2-step random unitary channel is described by a completely depolarising channel (in dimension \( d \), implemented by a set of \( d^2 \) orthogonal unitaries \( \{V_m\}_{m=1}^{d^2} \)) when used at a definite time step, and exhibits maximal correlations, described by a permutation \( \sigma \), between the choice of unitaries \( \{V_m\}_{m=0}^{d^2-1} \) (where \( V_m = V_n \otimes e^{i\phi_m} |\text{vac}\rangle \langle \text{vac}| \)) in successive uses. That is, \( \tilde{R}_A = \tilde{R}_B = \tilde{D}_\sigma \), where \( p(m, n) = \delta_{m, \sigma(n)} \). For the control (in this case the path of the particle) initialised in the superposition state \(|+\rangle\rangle \), the superposition of paths through \( \tilde{Z}(\tilde{D}_\sigma, \tilde{D}_\sigma) \) specified by the vacuum extension \( \mathcal{Z}(\tilde{D}_\sigma, \tilde{D}_\sigma) \) is given by

\[
S \left[ \mathcal{Z}(\tilde{D}_\sigma, \tilde{D}_\sigma) \right] \langle \rho \rangle + \langle + \rangle \rangle = \frac{d^2-1}{d} \sum_{m,k=0} \frac{V_{\sigma(k)} V_{m} V_{\sigma(m)}^\dagger \otimes |1\rangle \langle 0|}{d} = 1/d
\]

\[
\frac{d^2-1}{d} \sum_{m,k=0} \frac{V_{\sigma(m)} V_{m} V_{\sigma(m)}^\dagger \otimes |1\rangle \langle 0|}{d} = \mathcal{K}(\rho)
\]

and is depicted in Figure 8a. This reduces to the expression in Equation (8) in the main text when \( \mathcal{K}(\rho) \) is hermitian.

Figure 8b shows a comparison with the quantum switch supermap \( \mathcal{W} : \text{Chan}(A) \times \text{Chan}(B) \to \text{Chan}(M \otimes C) \) (with \( M \cong A \cong B \) and \( C \) two-dimensional) [30] taking as input two independent completely depolarising channels \( D_{m} \), which has an output equal to that of the superposition of paths \( S[\mathcal{Z}(\tilde{D}_{id}, \tilde{D}_{id})] \).

Appendix D: Superposition of paths through independent noisy channels: the vacuum interference operator \( F \)

In this Appendix, we make use of the notation and formalism of vacuum extensions and superposition of times introduced in Appendix A as well as the superposition of paths introduced in Appendix C.

Consider an ordinary quantum channel \( \mathcal{A}(\cdot) = \sum_{m=0} A_m(\cdot) A^\dagger m \in \text{Chan}(S) \), with vacuum extension \( \tilde{A} \subseteq \text{Chan}(S) \). The superposition of paths through a pair of (independent and identical) quantum channels \((A, A)\), specified by the vacuum extensions \((\tilde{A}, \tilde{A})\), is given by

\[
S(\tilde{A}, \tilde{A})(\rho \otimes |+\rangle \langle +|) = \frac{A(\rho) + F \rho F^\dagger}{2} \otimes |+\rangle \langle +| + \frac{A(\rho) - F \rho F^\dagger}{2} \otimes |-\rangle \langle -|,
\]

where \( F := \sum m \tilde{A}_m \) [28]. The operator \( F \) is called the vacuum interference operator, as it depends on the amount of interference between the one-particle and vacuum sectors. This can be found by considering the pair of channels \((A, A)\) as a bipartite channel \( A \otimes A \in \text{Chan}(S^{(1)} \otimes S^{(2)}) \) and applying Equation (C2) to derive the superposition of paths. This is equivalent to taking the superposition of times of \( A \otimes A \) considered as a 2-step
where the alternative channels traverse the two correlated channels in the opposite order (each correlated channel acts as the completely depolarising channel when used only once and has maximal correlations $\sigma$ between the choice of unitaries $\{V_m\}_{m=0}^{d^2-1}$ in successive uses), and (b) the quantum SWITCH of two independent completely depolarising channels $D = \sum_{m=0}^{d^2-1} \frac{1}{d} V_m$ (green) and $D = \sum_{k=0}^{d^2-1} \frac{1}{d} V_k$ (red). In both cases, $\{V_m\}_{m=0}^{d^2-1}$ is a set of $d^2$ orthogonal unitaries, with vacuum extensions $V_m = V_m \oplus e^{i\phi_m}|\text{vac}\rangle\langle\text{vac}|$. When $\sigma$ is equal to the identity permutation, the resulting channel in (a) is equal to the resulting channel in (b).

correlated channel, where the time-correlations are trivial, such that the correlated channel factorises into two independent channels.

The superposition of paths through a pair of independent channels, for the case where each channel is equal to the completely depolarising channel in dimension $d$, implemented by a set of $d^2$ orthogonal unitaries $\{V_m\}_{m=0}^{d^2-1}$ with vacuum extension $\tilde{D} = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{m=0}^{d^2-1} \tilde{V}_m$, where $\tilde{V}_m = V_m \oplus e^{i\phi_m}|\text{vac}\rangle\langle\text{vac}|$, is depicted in Figure 8.

We can also consider the superposition of paths through a pair of (independent and identical) concatenated quantum channels $(A \circ A, A \circ A)$, specified by the vacuum extensions $(\tilde{A} \circ \tilde{A}, \tilde{A} \circ \tilde{A})$. This results in the channel $\tilde{S}$ of $\tilde{A} \circ \tilde{A}$, which is given by the same expression as Equation 1 (11) but with $A(\rho)$ replaced by $A \circ \tilde{A}(\rho)$ and $F$ replaced by $F^2$. This is equivalent to the superposition of paths through two 2-step correlated channels, where the two paths traverse the two transmission lines in the opposite order, in the case where the time-correlations are trivial. This superposition of paths is depicted in Figure 9 (a) for the case of four completely depolarising channels realised through a uniform randomisation over $d^2$ orthogonal unitaries.

The communication advantages arising from using quantum channels in a superposition of paths, over a traditional wiring in parallel or sequence, are entirely determined by the parameters of the vacuum interference operator $F$ [28, 53, 54]. The communication advantages for classical communication have been quantified by the Holevo information $\chi[S(\cdot)]$ of the superposition channel [28, 53].

We consider the case where each channel is equal to the completely depolarising channel $D$ in dimension $d = 2$, implemented by a set of four orthogonal unitaries $\{V_m\}_{m=0}^{d^2-1}$ taken to be the four Pauli unitaries, with vacuum extension $\tilde{D} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=0}^{3} \tilde{V}_m$, where $\tilde{V}_m = V_m \oplus e^{i\phi_m}|\text{vac}\rangle\langle\text{vac}|$. The corresponding vacuum interference operator is $F = \sum_{m=0}^{3} \frac{1}{2} e^{-i\phi_m} V_m$. In this case, the Holevo information $\chi[S(D \circ D, D \circ D)]$ for all choices of phases $\{\phi_m\}_{m=0}^{3}$ is numerically found to be strictly less than the Holevo information $\chi[S(\tilde{D}, \tilde{D})]$, for all choices of phases $\{\phi_m\}_{m=0}^{3}$. This emphasises the fact that although the completely depolarising channel itself satisfies the relation $D \circ D = D$, the relation $D \circ D = D$ does not hold in general, and moreover the channel $D \circ D$ should be considered more noisy than $\tilde{D}$ [59].

We explain this result by considering the operator norm of the vacuum interference operator $F$.

We begin by showing that a property closely related to the Holevo information, namely the distinguishability of two input states $\rho, \sigma$ as characterised by the trace
distance of the corresponding output of the superposition channel, is bounded by the square of the Schatten ∞-norm $||F||_{\infty}$ of $F$:

**Proposition 2.** Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a constant channel, of the form $\mathcal{A}(\rho) = \rho_0$ for every input state $\rho$, let $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ be its vacuum extension, and let $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ be the effective channel resulting from the superposition of paths through the pair of quantum channels $(\mathcal{A}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}})$. For every pair of quantum states $\rho_0$ and $\rho_1$, given with prior probabilities $\pi_0$ and $\pi_1$, respectively, the trace distance between the output states of the channel $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ satisfies the bound

$$\left\| \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}})(\Delta) \right\|_1 \leq ||F||_{\infty}^2 ||\Delta||_1,$$

where $F := \sum_m \tilde{\alpha}_m A_m$ and $|| \cdot ||_{\infty}$ is the Schatten ∞-norm.

**Proof.** The desired bound follows from the following (in)equalities:

$$\left\| \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}})(\Delta) \right\|_1 = \left\| F \Delta F^\dagger \otimes \left( \frac{\{|+\rangle\langle+| - |-\rangle\langle-|\}}{2} \right) \right\|_1 = \left\| F \Delta F^\dagger \right\|_1 = \max_{U: U^\dagger U = I} \left\|UF\Delta F^\dagger\right\|_1 = \max_{U: U^\dagger U = I} \left\|F \Delta F^\dagger U^\dagger \right\|_1 = \max_{U: U^\dagger U = I} ||F^\dagger UF||_{\infty} ||\Delta||_1 \leq \max_{U: U^\dagger U = I} ||F^\dagger UF||_{\infty} ||U||_{\infty} ||F||_{\infty} ||\Delta||_1 = \left\| F \right\|_{\infty}^2 ||\Delta||_1.$$

For the case of the superposition of paths through two completely depolarising channels implemented via a uniform randomisation over $d^2$ orthogonal unitaries $\{V_m\}_{m=0}^{d^2-1}$, with unitary vacuum extensions $\tilde{V}_m = V_m \otimes e^{i\phi_m}|\text{vac}\rangle\langle\text{vac}|$, we find that $||F||_{\infty} < 1 \forall F = \sum_{m=0}^{d^2-1} \frac{1}{d^2} e^{i\phi_m} V_m$, and hence $||F^2||_{\infty} < ||F||_{\infty}$. In Ref. [59], the result $||F^2||_{\infty} < ||F||_{\infty}$ is proven to hold for all vacuum extensions of the completely depolarising channel, except for the vacuum extension with $F = 0$, which does not preserve coherence between the vacuum and one-particle sectors.

Since the vacuum interference operator of $\mathcal{S}(\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \circ \tilde{\mathcal{D}}, \tilde{\mathcal{D}} \circ \tilde{\mathcal{D}})$ is $F^2$, this result together with Proposition 2 provides an analytical explanation for why the Holevo information of $\mathcal{S}(\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \circ \tilde{\mathcal{D}}, \tilde{\mathcal{D}} \circ \tilde{\mathcal{D}})$ is always less than that of $\mathcal{S}(\tilde{\mathcal{D}} , \tilde{\mathcal{D}})$.

Numerical analysis in $d = 2$ reveals that over all possible $F$, as parametrised by the phases $\{\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3\}$, the maximum norm of $F^2$ is less than the minimum norm of $F$. Moreover, the Holevo information exhibits a clear trend which monotonically increases with the norm of $F$ (or $F^2$). A plot of the Holevo information against $||F||_{\infty}$ (or $||F^2||_{\infty}$) is given in Figure 10. The minimum value of the Holevo information for the superposition of paths through two independent completely depolarising channels occurs in 8 cases when $F$ is proportional to a unitary. This minimum value is equal to 0.049. The eight minima where $F$ is proportional to a unitary are clearly seen in Figure 2 in the main text.